arXiv:1510.07646v2 [astro-ph.HE] 4 Feb 2016

Quark Nugget Dark Matter: No contradictions with neutrino flux constraints.

K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky
Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z1, Canada

It has recently been claimed [1] that dark matter in the form of quark nuggets cannot account for more than 20% of the dark matter density. This claim is based on constraints on the neutrino flux in the 20-50 MeV range where the sensitivity of underground neutrino detectors such as Super-Kamiokande have their highest signal-to-noise ratio. We stress the dependence of this claim on the details of the annihilation of visible baryons with an antiquark nugget and of the resulting neutrino spectrum. In particular if the annihilation occurs in the bulk of an antiquark nugget in the colour superconducting (CS) phase the lightest pseudo Goldstone mesons (the pions and Kaons) have masses in the 20 MeV range, in contrast with the conventional mesons for which $m_\pi \simeq 140$ MeV. Thus, the decay of these light pseudo Goldstone bosons of the CS phase cannot produce highly energetic neutrinos in the 20-50 MeV energy range. We predict the basic properties of the resulting neutrino spectrum and argue that, while nuggets composed of purely nuclear matter would be effectively ruled out, there remains a wide class of CS models which are fully consistent with present neutrino flux constraints. However, future neutrino observations may offer a strong potential test of these models.

I. INTRODUCTION

This work is motivated by the recent preprint [1], in which the authors claim that the interactions of (anti) nuggets with normal matter in the Earth and Sun will lead to annihilation and an associated neutrino flux. As the antineutrino spectrum is strongly constrained by SuperK observations it was argued in [1] that nuggets producing a significant neutrino flux in the 20-50 MeV range cannot account for more than 20% of the dark matter density. In response to this claim we conduct a more extensive analysis of the neutrino spectrum than has been previously provided and demonstrate that the spectrum is in fact peaked at lower energies where the constraints are not as strong.

Conventional baryon-antibaryon annihilation typically produces a large number of pions which eventually decay though an intermediate muon and thus generate a significant number of neutrinos and antineutrinos in the range where SuperK has a high sensitivity. We will argue that the critical difference in the case of nuclear annihilations involving an antiquark nugget is that the annihilation proceeds within the colour superconducting (CS) phase where the energetics are significantly different. The main point is that in most CS phases the lightest pseudo Goldstone mesons (the pions and Kaons) have masses in the 20 MeV range [2, 3] in huge contrast with the hadronic confined phase where $m_\pi \sim 140$ MeV. Therefore, the decay of light pseudo Goldstone mesons of the CS phase cannot produce neutrinos in the 20-50 MeV energy range and are not subject to the SuperK constraints employed in [1]. Some fraction of annihilations will occur sufficiently near the quark surface that the secondary mesons may form outside of the colour superconductor. As they produce the only potentially relativistic charged particles able to escape the nugget these surface events were important in assessing the ability of a nugget to produce an extensive air shower as in [4]. However these event will represent only a small fraction of all annihilations and thus of total neutrino production. This fraction was not expressly calculated in [4] which was primarily interested in the general details of shower geometry. We will argue here that in the physically well motivated scenario where only a few percent of annihilations result in this sort of near surface muon production the constraints imposed by SuperK are evaded.

II. QUARK NUGGET DARK MATTER

Before turning to the details of neutrino production we will first give a brief overview of the quark nugget dark matter model. The idea that the dark matter may take the form of composite objects of standard model quarks in a novel phase goes back to stranglet models [5]. In these models the presence of strange quarks stabilize quark matter at sufficiently high densities allowing strangelets formed in the early universe to remain stable over cosmological timescales. The quark nugget model is conceptually similar, with the nuggets being composed of a high density colour superconducting phase. The only new crucial element proposed in [6, 7], in comparison with the previous studies [5] is that the nuggets could be made of matter as well as antimatter in this framework. For further details see the original papers [6–8] as well as the recent short review [9].

The original motivation for this model was as follows: It is generally assumed that the universe began in a symmetric state with zero global baryonic charge and later (through some baryon number violating process) evolved into a state with a net positive baryon number. As an alternative to this scenario we advocate a model in which "baryogenesis" is actually a charge separation process in which the global baryon number of the universe remains zero. In this model the unobserved antibaryons come to comprise the dark matter in the form of dense nuggets of quarks and antiquarks. In this model baryogenesis occurs at the QCD phase transition. Both quarks and anti-

quarks are thermally abundant in the primordial plasma but, in addition to forming conventional baryons, some fraction of them are bound into heavy nuggets of quark matter in a colour superconducting phase. The formation of the nuggets made of matter and antimatter occurs through the dynamics of collapsing axion domain walls.

If the fundamental θ parameter were identically zero at the early universe QCD phase transition, equal numbers of nuggets made of matter and antimatter would be formed. This would result in the vanishing of the visible baryon density at the present epoch and no baryogenesis effect. However, the fundamental CP violating processes associated with the θ term in QCD (which is assumed to be non-zero at the QCD phase transition) result in the preferential formation of antinuggets over nuggets[1]. This source of strong CP violation is no longer available at the present epoch as a result of the dynamics of the axion, see e.g. recent reviews [10–13] on this subject.

The remaining antibaryons in the early universe plasma then annihilate away leaving only the baryons whose antimatter counterparts are bound in the excess of antiquark nuggets and are thus unavailable to annihilate. All asymmetry effects at $\theta \sim 1$ are order one which is precisely why the resulting visible and dark matter densities must be the same order of magnitude

$$\Omega_{\rm dark} \approx \Omega_{\rm visible} \tag{1}$$

as they are both proportional to the same fundamental $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ scale, and they both are originated at the same QCD epoch[2]. In particular, the observed matter to dark matter ratio $\Omega_{\rm dark} \simeq 5 \cdot \Omega_{\rm visible}$ corresponds to a scenario in which the number of antinuggets is larger than the number of nuggets by a factor of $\sim 3/2$ at the end of nugget formation. This would result in a matter content with baryons, quark nuggets and antiquark nuggets in an approximate ratio

$$|B_{\rm visible}| : |B_{\rm nuggets}| : |B_{\rm antinuggets}| \simeq 1 : 2 : 3, \tag{2}$$

with no net baryonic charge. If these processes are not fundamentally related the two components $\Omega_{\rm dark}$ and $\Omega_{\rm visible}$ could easily exist at vastly different scales.

We present below a short overview describing a possible formation mechanism for these nuggets based on axion domain wall dynamics following [6], see also another proposal [14] when formation of the nuggets is associated with drastically different types of the domain walls.

Though the QCD phase diagram at $\theta \neq 0$ as a function of temperature and chemical potential is basically unknown, it is well understood that θ is in fact an angular variable, and therefore supports various types of domain walls, including the so-called $N = 1$ domain walls across which θ interpolates between one and the same physical vacuum state $\theta \to \theta + 2\pi$. Furthermore, it is expected that closed bubbles made of these $N = 1$ axion domain walls are also produced during the QCD phase transition with a typical wall tension $\sigma_a \sim m_a^{-1}$ where m_a is the axion mass. The collapse of these closed bubbles is halted due to the fermi pressure inside the bubbles which counters the wall tension. The crucial element which stops the collapse of the bubbles from complete annihilation is the presence of the QCD substructure inside the axion domain wall. This substructure forms immediately after the QCD phase transition as discussed in [6]. The equilibrium of the obtained system has been analyzed in [6] for a specific axion domain wall tension within the observationally allowed window $10^{-6}{\rm eV} \leq m_a \leq 10^{-3}{\rm eV}$ consistent with the recent constraints [10–13]. It has also been argued in [6] that equilibrium is typically achieved when the Fermi pressure inside the nuggets falls into the region in which colour superconductivity sets in[3].

The fact that the CS phase may be realized in nature in the cores of neutron stars has been known for some time [2, 3]. A new element advocated in [6] is that a similar dense environment may be realized in nature if the axion domain wall pressure plays a role of a "squeezer", similar to the gravitational pressure in the neutron star physics.

Using dimensional arguments one can easily infer that the size and the baryon charge of the nuggets must scale with the axion mass as follows

$$\sigma_a \sim m_a^{-1}, \quad R \sim \sigma_a, \quad B \sim \sigma_a^3. \tag{3}$$

Therefore, as the axion mass m_a varies within the observationally allowed window $10^{-6}{\rm eV} \leq m_a \leq 10^{-3}{\rm eV}$ the nuggets parameters vary as follows

$$10^{-6}{\rm cm} \lesssim R \lesssim 10^{-3}{\rm cm}, \quad 10^{23} \lesssim B \lesssim 10^{32}. \tag{4}$$

This essentially determines the allowed parameter space for the quark nuggets. Much of the corresponding allowed region is essentially unconstrained by present experiments, as will be discussed below.

Another fundamental ratio (along with $\Omega_{\rm dark} \simeq 5\Omega_{\rm visible}$ discussed above) is the baryon to entropy ratio at present time

$$\eta \equiv \frac{n_B - n_{\bar B}}{n_\gamma} \simeq \frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} \sim 10^{-10}. \tag{5}$$

In our proposal (in contrast with conventional baryogenesis frameworks) this ratio is determined by the formation

[1] This preference is essentially determined by the sign of θ.

[2] The feature that this model produces visible and dark matter at roughly the same scale is largely insensitive to the absolute value of the initial magnitude of the θ parameter. In other words, this model does not require any fine tuning of the initial θ value.

[3] In this framework bubble formation does not require a first order phase transition as was required in the original strangelet proposal [5]. This is because the $N = 1$ axion domain walls form irrespective of the order of the phase transition. The phase diagram in general and the order of the phase transition in particular at $\theta \neq 0$ are still unknown because of the well known "sign problem" in the QCD lattice simulations at $\theta \neq 0$.

temperature $T_{\rm form}$ at which the nuggets and antinuggets compete their formation and below which annihilation does not significantly affect the nuggets' composition. As the present day baryon to photon ratio (5) is very small this model is not highly sensitive to the efficiency of nugget formation provided it is still larger than 10^{-10}. Following their initial formation the nuggets remain coupled to the baryon plasma until it has cooled to $T_{\rm form}$ and it is this decoupling that fixes the ratio (5) rather than the original distribution of nuggets, as specified in footnote (2) this result is also insensitive to the initial value of the θ parameter. This temperature is determined by many factors: transmission/reflection coefficients, evolution of the nuggets, expansion of the universe, cooling rates, evaporation rates, the dynamics of the axion domain wall network, etc. All these effects, in general, may equally contribute to determining $T_{\rm form}$ at the QCD scale. Technically, the corresponding effects are hard to compute from the first principles as even the basic properties of the QCD phase diagram at $\theta \neq 0$ are still unknown. However, the estimate of $T_{\rm form}$ within a factor of 2 is quite a simple exercise as $T_{\rm form}$ must be proportional to the gap $\Delta \sim 100$ MeV when the CS phase sets in inside the nuggets. The observed ratio (5) corresponds to $T_{\rm form} \simeq 41$ MeV, see [7] for the details. This temperature indeed represents a typical QCD scale, slightly below the critical temperature $T_c \simeq 0.6\Delta \simeq 60$ MeV, according to standard estimates for colour superconductivity, see reviews [2, 3].

Unlike conventional dark matter candidates, such as WIMPs (Weakly interacting Massive Particles) the dark-matter/antimatter nuggets are strongly interacting and macroscopically large. However, they do not contradict any of the many known observational constraints on dark matter or antimatter for three main reasons [8]:

- They carry a huge (anti)baryon charge $|B| \gtrsim 10^{25}$, and so have an extremely tiny number density;
- The nuggets have nuclear densities, so their effective interaction is small $\sigma/M \sim 10^{-10}$ cm^2/g, well below the typical astrophysical and cosmological limits which are on the order of $\sigma/M < 1$ cm^2/g;
- They have a large binding energy such that the baryon charge locked in the nuggets is not available to participate in big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) at $T \approx 1$ MeV.

There are currently a number of both ground based and astrophysical observations which impose constraints on allowed quark nugget dark matter parameters. These include the non-detection of a nugget flux by the IceCube monopole search [15] which limits the flux of nuggets to $\Phi_N < 1{\rm km}^{-2}\ {\rm yr}^{-1}$. Similar limits are likely also obtainable from the results of the Antarctic Impulse Transient Antenna (ANITA) [16]. It has also been estimated in [17] that, based on Apollo data, nuggets of mass from ~ 10 kg to 1 ton (corresponding to $B \sim 10^{28\text{-}30}$) must account for less than an order of magnitude of the local dark matter. While our preferred range of $B \sim 10^{25}$, see below, is somewhat smaller and is not excluded by [17], we still believe that $B \geq 10^{28}$ is not completely excluded by the Apollo data, as the corresponding constraints are based on specific model dependent assumptions about the nugget mass-distribution.

While ground based direct searches offer the most unambiguous channel for the detection of quark nuggets the flux of nuggets is inversely proportional to the nugget mass and consequently even the largest available detectors are incapable of excluding a nugget flux across their entire potential mass range.

To reiterate: the weakness of the visible-dark matter interaction is achieved in this model due to the small geometrical parameter $\sigma/M \sim B^{-1/3}$ rather than due to a weak coupling of a new fundamental field to standard model particles. In other words, this small effective interaction $\sim \sigma/M \sim B^{-1/3}$ replaces a conventional requirement of sufficiently weak interactions of the visible matter with WIMPs.

The mean baryon number of the nuggets $\langle B \rangle$ is, in principle, calculable from first principles. However, such a calculation depends on the strongly coupled, non-equilibrium physics of the QCD phase transition and is subject to large uncertainties. As such, we treat $\langle B \rangle$ as a parameter to be constrained observationally with larger $\langle B \rangle$ values producing weaker observational consequences as discussed above. Any such consequences will be largest where the densities of both visible and dark matter are largest such as in the core of the galaxy or the early universe. In other words, the nuggets behave like conventional cold dark matter in environments where the density of the visible matter is small, while they become interacting and radiating objects (i.e. effectively become visible matter) if they enter an environment of sufficiently large density.

A variety of astrophysical observations suggest that, in order to avoid over producing the observed galactic diffuse background the nuggets must have a sufficiently large $\langle B \rangle > 10^{24}$. It should be noted that the galactic spectrum contains several excesses of diffuse emission the origin of which is unknown, the best known example being the strong galactic 511 keV line. If the nuggets have a baryon number in the $\langle B \rangle \sim 10^{25}$ range they could offer a potential explanation for several of these diffuse components. For further details see the original works [18–25]. In all these cases photon emission originates from the outer layer of the nuggets known as the electrosphere. The properties of the electrosphere are not very sensitive to the specific features of the CS phase realized in the dense nugget core. By contrast, in our present study the structure of the nugget's core plays the crucial role as neutrino emission originates from within the dense CS matter. We review the features of the CS phase relevant to neutrino emission in the next section.

III. COLOUR SUPERCONDUCTIVITY AND QUARK NUGGETS

There are many possible CS phases due to the generation of a gap Δ through different channels with slightly different properties. While the relevant physics is a part of the standard model, QCD with no free parameters, the corresponding phase diagram is still a matter of debate as it strongly depends on the precise numerical value of the gap Δ, see review articles [2, 3]. For our purposes though the key characteristics are very much the same for all phases. Therefore, we limit ourself below to reviewing the most developed, the so called CFL (colour flavour locking) phase.

A. Quasi-particles in the CFL phase

As already mentioned, the physics of photon radiation is dominated by the low-energy degrees of freedom present at the quark matter surface and in the electrosphere. The neutrino emission is entirely determined by the dense quark matter realized in the nugget's core. Within the nuggets, the picture is of some charged phase of colour-superconducting matter with a gap of some $\Delta \simeq 100$ MeV, and with a free Fermi-gas of positrons to maintain neutrality. In order to discuss neutrino production in this context we will first enumerate the basic excitations of the CS phase the decay of which will give rise to the neutrino spectrum.

Quarks and Gluons: The fundamental excitations in quark matter at sufficiently high densities are the quarks (similar to baryon octet p, Σ, Ξ of the conventional hadronic phase) and gluons (similar to vector meson octet ρ, ω, ϕ, K^* of the hadronic phase). In contrast with the hadronic phase, however, these excitations are coloured. They are strongly interacting quasi-particles and have "masses" on the order of the superconducting gap ~ 100 MeV which is much smaller than the typical mass scale ~ 1 GeV of the excitations (the hadrons) in the confined phase. Although the initial annihilation will produce these quasi-particles, the energy will ultimately be transferred to lower energy degrees of freedom which are the Nambu-Goldstone Bosons.

As they act as only a brief intermediate phase of the decay chain, we shall not elaborate on detailed properties of these relatively heavy strongly interacting quasi-particles. These properties are not essential in determining the neutrino production spectrum, which is the main subject of this work. The only comment we would like to make here is that the splitting between different quark states (similar to p, Σ, Ξ) is of order $m_s^2/(2\mu) \sim 15$ MeV where m_s is the strange quark mass and μ is the quark chemical potential, see for example [2]. This represents a tiny energy in comparison with the splitting in the conventional hadronic phase where the relevant scale is determined by the strange quark mass m_s itself and is of order 150 MeV. These estimates suggest that even in rare events when a heavy quark decays to a lighter cousin with emission of a neutrino, the corresponding neutrino's energy will not exceed 10 MeV in the CFL phase.

Pseudo–Nambu-Goldstone Bosons (Mesons): The spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry in colour-superconductors gives rise to low-energy pseudo–Nambu-Goldstone modes with similar quantum numbers to the mesons (pions, kaons, etc.). These objects, however, are collective excitations of the CS state rather than vacuum excitations as is the case for the conventional confined hadronic phase. The finite quark masses explicitly break chiral symmetry, giving rise to these "pseudo"–Nambu-Goldstone modes on the order of 10 -20 MeV, in huge contrast with the hadronic confined phase where the lightest mass meson has $m_\pi \simeq 140$ MeV. However, the hierarchy between the lightest Nambu-Goldstone (NG) and vector meson masses approximately holds for both: CFL and hadronic phases with $m_{NG}/m_\rho \approx 1/5$.

To be more precise, we consider large μ limit for which the masses and other relevant parameters in the CFL phase can be explicitly computed [2, 3]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{\pi^\pm} &\simeq \frac{2c}{f_\pi^2} m_s(m_u + m_d), \quad f_\pi^2 \sim \mu^2 \\
m^2_{K^\pm} &\simeq \frac{2c}{f_\pi^2} m_d(m_u + m_s), \quad c \simeq \frac{3\Delta^2}{2\pi^2} \\
m^2_{K^0} &\simeq \frac{2c}{f_\pi^2} m_u(m_d + m_s), \quad v^2_{NG} = \frac{1}{3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}
$$

In these formula $f_\pi \sim 100$ MeV is proportional to the chemical potential and plays the same role as the pion decay constant (f_π) in the conventional confined hadronic phase; v_{NG} deviates from speed of light due to the explicit violation of the Lorentz invariance in the system such that the dispersion relations for all quasiparticles are drastically different from their counterparts in vacuum. The modes in (6) are all strongly interacting and include both charged ($K^\pm$, K, $\bar{K}$, $\pi^\pm$) and truly neutral (π^0, η, η') modes. These neutral modes get mixed but, while the corresponding mass matrix is also known, our discusssion does not require an explicit expression for this matrix, as the typical scale remains the same as presented in (6).

There are a few very important differences (aside from $v_{NG} \neq 1$) between the NG modes of the CFL phase and those of the confined hadronic phase. First of all, the NG bosons are much lighter than in vacuum. This is because their masses are proportional to m_q^2 rather than to m_q, as at zero chemical

potential. In addition, there is a further suppression by a factor of $\Delta/\mu \ll 1$ which arises because the NG bosons are collective excitations of the diquark condensate, in contrast with the chiral vacuum condensate of the confined phase. As a result the kaon of the CS phase is lighter than the CS pion, by a factor of $m_d/(m_d + m_u)$. As a result, the lightest NG meson, the kaon, has a mass in the range of 5 to 20 MeV depending on Δ and taking $\mu \simeq 400$ MeV, see for example [3].

Another important difference between the NG modes in dense matter and in vacuum is in the dispersion relations for the NG modes which assume the following form, see for example [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{K^\pm} &= \mp\frac{m_s^2}{2\mu} + \sqrt{v_{NG}^2 p^2 + m_{K^\pm}^2} \\ E_{K^0} &= -\frac{m_s^2}{2\mu} + \sqrt{v_{NG}^2 p^2 + m_{K^0}^2} \\ E_{\bar{K}^0} &= +\frac{m_s^2}{2\mu} + \sqrt{v_{NG}^2 p^2 + m_{K^0}^2} \\ E_{\pi^\pm} &= \sqrt{v_{NG}^2 p^2 + m_{\pi^\pm}^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

such that the rest energy of the lightest NG mesons does not exceed the 10-20 MeV range. In fact E_{K^0} may even vanish, in which case the K^0 field forms a condensate (the so-called CFL K^0-phase). We shall not elaborate on this topic in the present paper but instead refer the interested reader to the review article [2] and the large number of references on original works cited there.

One should comment here that the dispersion relations for the NG modes within the anti-nuggets can be obtained from (7) by replacing $\mu \to -\mu$ such that the lightest NG states become $\bar{K}^0$ and K^- for nuggets made of antimatter.

The drastic differences in properties between the NG modes in dense matter and in vacuum reviewed above play the key role in our discussions of the neutrino emission from CS nuggets, which is the subject of section III C.

Nambu-Goldstone Phonon: There is one truly massless Nambu-Goldstone mode which is associated with spontaneous baryon number violation. This mode, however, carries neither colour nor electric charge. Thus, it is extremely weakly coupled to the other NG modes and plays an insignificant role in the processes we consider here. Nevertheless, it may also emit neutrinos. Therefore, it will also be briefly discussed in section III C along with the main neutrino emitters, the lightest NG states.

B. Energy Transfer

Now we consider how energy is transferred from nucleon annihilation events to radiation and neutrino emission. Nucleons impinging upon antimatter nuggets will penetrate some characteristic depth $d \ll R$ much less than the radius of the nuggets. The depth will be set by the nuclear interaction scale: For example, if the annihilation p^+p^- cross-section is taken to be the vacuum value, the proton will have a lifetime of only 2 fm/c. However, as argued in [23] the lifetime could be considerably larger in the CS phases due to the coherence requirement for annihilation, whereby the quantum numbers for all three antiquarks must be correlated for a successful annihilation with the incoming proton, in this case the lifetime could be as large as 100 fm/c.

A simple way to explain the argument is to consider QCD with a large number of colours N_c. In this case a colour singlet incoming nucleon entering the CS phase must pick up three antiquarks for successful annihilation. These three antiquarks cannot have arbitrary colour properties, but rather must be precisely organized in an appropriate colour singlet combination. While the choice for the first antiquark is arbitrary, the choice for an appropriate colour for the second and third quark would lead to the suppression factor $N_c^{-1} \cdot N_c^{-1}$. This suppression effect is similar in many respects to a phenomenon which is known to occur for (composite) soliton- antisoliton annihilation in condensed matter physics. Generically, the probability for the soliton- antisoliton elastic scattering is much larger than the probability for annihilation[4]. Furthermore, the momentum distribution for quarks from a nucleon in vacuum is drastically different from momentum distribution in the CS phase where momentum counts from the fermi surface. The corresponding momentum wave function overlap will thus also be suppressed. In fact, the tendency of increasing lifetime with increasing chemical potential has been previously discussed for relatively low densities in the case of annihilation of anti-nucleons in nuclear matter [27]. In that paper it has been argued that the lifetime could be considerably larger (possibly even 10-30 fm/c) than the fm/c scale observed in vacuum.

In any case, on the scale of the nuggets, the annihilations will take place within $d \sim 100$ fm or so from the surface, which is still within the regime where the quark matter is charged. Thus, the annihilations take place in a region of quark matter where there are positrons present to maintain beta-equilibrium and neutrality. These positrons are the lightest modes that couple strongly and will thus ultimately carry most of the annihilation energy as argued in [23].

[4] Similarly, the composite magnetic monopole- antimonopole annihilation rate is much smaller than a typical dimensional analysis (represented by the size of the system) would suggest, see e.g.[26] and references therein.

The nucleon annihilation will initially produce a handful of high energy strongly interacting gluons and quarks with properties as described in the previous section III A. These will stream away from the annihilation site with about half streaming towards the surface of the nuggets, and ultimately transfering their energy to high-energy positrons. This portion of the energy released as a result of annihilation is emitted as electromagnetic radiation in the form of diffused x rays as discussed in [23], and shall not be discussed further in this work. The other half, however, will proceed deep within the nuggets.

The strongly interacting gluons and quarks which move towards the nugget's core will rapidly decay into pseudo–Nambu-Goldstone collective modes (similar to $\rho \to 2\pi$ decays in hadronic matter), distributing energy down to their mass scale of 20 MeV or so. Thus, through this mechanism, some fraction of the initial 2 GeV annihilation energy will ultimately be transferred to the NG modes. These NG modes will then undergo weak decays emitting the neutrinos which are the focus of the present work.

The goal of the next section is to advocate that the energy of the majority of these neutrinos will not exceed 20 MeV. This claim is in drastic contrast with hadronic phase where the π and K mesons generically emit highly energetic neutrinos in the 50 MeV range through direct production or through μ-lepton emission and subsequent decay into energetic neutrinos.

C. Neutrino emission from NG bosons

The neutrino emission from CFL phase quark matter has been studied previously in a number of papers mostly in context of the physics of neutron stars, see the original papers [28–30] and the review article [2]. In this subsection we will elaborate on estimates of neutrino emission from the superconducting quark nuggets and anti-nuggets.

First, we want to argue that the heaviest NG mesons (the K^- and $\bar{K^0}$ from (7)), which might be as massive as 80 MeV according to [29], and which may potentially produce sufficiently energetic neutrinos to violate the SuperK constraints at energies > 20 MeV, generically do not produce such energetic neutrinos.

There are a few suppression factors which lead to this conclusion. First of all, the production of strange K mesons is suppressed due to the so-called "Zweig rule" when a $\bar{s}s$ pair must be produced from the ground state as a result of annihilation. This suppression factor must be proportional to $1/N_c^2 \sim 0.1$ where $N_c = 3$ is the number of colours in QCD. This suppression factor is well understood theoretically and well established experimentally in numerous $p\bar{p}$ and $\bar{p}A$ experiments at low and high energies when the mass difference between strange and non-strange particles does not play a role. We expect this suppression to hold even when K mesons are lighter that the π mesons.

The next argument behind this claim is the observation that the heaviest NG mesons mainly decay to their lighter NG cousins (similar to $K \to \pi\pi$ in hadronic phase) with a much larger probability than to an electron accompanied by neutrinos, $K^\pm \to e^\pm \nu$. The basic reason is that the corresponding matrix elements are always suppressed by the electron mass[5]. As a result, the heaviest NG modes in the CFL phase to not generically decay with the emission of energetic neutrinos. This is of course in huge contrast with the conventional pattern in the hadronic phase where leptonic decays $K^\pm \to \mu^\pm \nu$ represent the main channel of the $K^\pm$ decays. The point is that even the heaviest NG mesons in the CFL phase are still much lighter than the muon. Therefore, this $\mu^\pm \nu$ channel of K decay is kinematically forbidden.

The 3-particle decays (similar to $K^\pm \to \pi^0 e^\pm \nu$ in hadronic phase) are not strictly kinematically forbidden, and not suppressed by a factor of m_e. Nevertheless, it is expected to be smaller (at least by a factor of ~ 0.2) in comparison with the dominant $K \to 2\pi$ decay in analogy with a similar 3-particle phase volume suppression in vacuum. Furthermore, a typical energy for the neutrino in such 3-particle decay is quite small as the largest chunk of the available energy goes to the pion mass which is of order 30 MeV according to [29]. In other words, the peak of the intensity distribution is achieved at $\sim \frac{1}{3}(80-30)$MeV ~ 16 MeV, while the probability of finding a neutrino with a larger energy (> 20 MeV) is suppressed. This factor is an addition to the suppression factors (due to the Zweig rule and 3-particle phase volume) already mentioned above.

These generic arguments suggest that the majority of neutrinos will be emitted by the lightest rather than the heaviest NG bosons, similar to $\pi^\pm \to e^\pm \nu$. In this case the energy of the emitted neutrinos is in range of 15 MeV for the CFL phase. In addition, as we argued above, muons cannot be produced at all in the CFL phase for purely kinematical reasons. Therefore, the energetic neutrinos which played the key role in analysis of [1] and which are normally produced in the $\mu^\pm \to e^\pm \nu_e \nu_\mu$ decay channels and are not generally produced when these decays occur within the CS matter. This it the essential point of the present analysis.

For completeness of our analysis of neutrino emission we will also make few comments on the process $\pi^0 \to \nu\bar{\nu}$ which is strongly suppressed in vacuum, but may occur in quark dense matter. The corresponding decay, in terms

[5] This statement is correct for temperatures $T \simeq 0$ close to zero. For non vanishing temperature there is an extra contribution which does not have a vacuum counterpart. This contribution is generated by the explicit violation of Lorentz invariance in the system when the NG fields couple to the temporal and the spatial components of the axial vector current with different constants. However, this extra contribution does not modify our claim because the typical temperature of the nuggets considered in the present work is small, $T \ll m_e$, see section III D for the estimates.

of kinematics, is similar to the $K^{\pm} \to e^{\pm}\nu$ decay mentioned above. Therefore, it must also be proportional to the lepton mass in vacuum, m_ν^2 which is very close to zero. This is precisely the source of the strong suppression of the $\pi^0 \to \nu\bar{\nu}$ decay in vacuum. However, in the CFL phase the relevant matrix element is not proportional to m_ν due to the explicit violation of Lorentz invariance, similar to the extra term in the $K^{\pm} \to e^{\pm}\nu$ decay mentioned above (see footnote 5 for a few comments and also the references [28, 29] where the corresponding computations were originally performed). Nevertheless, this type of suppression still holds in our case due to relatively low temperature $T \ll m_e$ of the nuggets while travelling thorough the sun, as will be argued in the following section.

Finally, neutrinos might be also produced in CFL phase through the process $\phi + \phi \to \phi + \nu + \bar{\nu}$ where ϕ is the truly massless NG boson associated with spontaneous baryon number violation. The corresponding process is highly suppressed [28] as the amplitude is proportional to the temperature which is very small in this problem as estimated in the next section.

D. Temperature of nuggets travelling through the sun

We follow ref. [21] in our estimation of the temperature of the nuggets as they travel through the sun. The basic idea is to equate the total surface emissivity $F_{\rm tot}$ with the rate at which annihilations deposit energy $F_{\rm ann}$ within a given environment. The total surface emissivity has been computed in [21]. It is mostly determined by photon emission from the electrosphere, and it is given by

$$F_{\rm tot} = \frac{{\rm d}E}{{\rm d}t\ {\rm d}A} \simeq \frac{16}{3}\frac{T^4\alpha^{5/2}}{\pi}\sqrt[4]{\frac{T}{m}} \tag{8}$$

In order to maintain the overall energy balance, the nuggets must emit energy at the same rate that it is deposited through proton annihilation,

$$F_{\rm tot} = (1-g)F_{\rm ann} = (1-g)\frac{{\rm d}E_{\rm ann}}{{\rm d}t\,{\rm d}A}, \tag{9}$$

where $1-g$ is the fraction of the annihilation energy that is thermalized (and thus g is the fraction of energy emitted directly by excited positrons.) Note that both the rate of emission and the rate of annihilation are expressed per unit surface area, so that the equilibrium condition is independent of the nuggets' size, and therefore of their average baryon number $\langle B\rangle$.

The rate of annihilation $F_{\rm ann}$ is

$$F_{\rm ann} = 2\ {\rm GeV}\cdot f\cdot v\cdot n_{\rm sun} \tag{10}$$

where 2 GeV $= 2\,m_p$ is the energy liberated by proton annihilation, v is the average speed of the nugget through the sun, $n_{\rm sun}$ is the average nucleon density in the sun, and $f \sim 0.1$ is a suppression factor due to the possibility of reflection from the sharp quark-matter surface.

The typical galactic scale for the speed is $v \sim 300$ km/s $\sim 10^{-3}c$, while the density $n_{\rm sun} \sim 10^{24}{\rm cm}^{-3}$

Combining these numerical values, we obtain

$$F_{\rm ann} \sim \frac{10^{30}\ {\rm GeV}}{{\rm cm}^2\cdot{\rm s}}\cdot\left(\frac{f}{10^{-1}}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{v}{10^{-3}c}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{n_{\rm sun}}{10^{24}/{\rm cm}^3}\right) \tag{11}$$

which must be compared with the total surface emissivity (8) which in appropriate units can be represented as

$$F_{\rm tot} \sim 10^{30}\frac{\rm GeV}{{\rm cm}^2\cdot{\rm s}}\left(\frac{T}{0.1\ {\rm MeV}}\right)^{4+1/4}. \tag{12}$$

Taking the typical values for these parameters mentioned above and comparing (11) with (12) we arrive at an estimate of a temperature of $T \simeq 0.1$ MeV for anti-nuggets travelling through the sun.

This numerical value for the temperature $T \simeq 0.1$ MeV is important in making a few conclusions. First, the relatively heavy NG bosons with rest energy $\sim$ 80 MeV do not generically decay to energetic neutrinos $K \to e\nu$ as the conventional suppression factor $\sim m_e^2$ still holds even for this non-zero temperatures because the relevant temperature is quite low as we argued above, $T \ll m_e$. Second, the estimate $T \simeq 0.1$ MeV represents a typical width for 2-particle decays such as $\pi \to e\nu$ or $\pi^0 \to \nu\bar{\nu}$, at zero temperature this width would be practically zero as the energy is unambiguously fixed by the mass of the decaying particle.

We end this section with the following important conclusion: most of the neutrinos produced in the CFL phase are a result of the decay of the lightest $\pi^{\pm}$ mesons. Therefore, the typical energy of the emitted neutrinos is expected to be in the 10-15 MeV range, in contrast with the 50 MeV scale associated with conventional hadronic decays as used in the analysis of [1].

Qualitatively our argument may be understood as follows: the typical mass scale of the NG bosons in the CFL phase is 5-10 times smaller than in vacuum. Therefore, we expect that the average number of NG bosons produced per annihilation event (releasing $\sim$ 2 GeV energy per event) is a factor of 5-10 larger than in vacuum. Thus, the average number of emitted neutrinos per annihilation event will also be a factor of 5-10 larger than in vacuum. The average energy of these neutrinos is set by the NG mass and is thus smaller by the same factor of 5-10. This difference in the properties of the neutrino spectrum plays the key role in any assessment of the predictions of the neutrino flux from antiquark nuggets in terms of constraints on the observed neutrino flux.

IV. NEUTRINO FLUX CONSTRAINTS

The capture of quark nuggets by the sun and their subsequent annihilation will produce an additional component in the solar neutrino spectrum. For comparative

purposes we will adopt the solar capture rate used in [1] which was predicted to generate an antineutrino flux on the order of $\sim 10\ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. As argued above this number could easily be a factor of ten larger due to the larger number of light NG states produced. As such, we will consider the possibility that the total flux of neutrinos generated by the annihilation of quark nuggets within the sun could be as large as,

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{tot}} \approx 100\ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}. \tag{13}$$

Of these roughly half will be neutrinos and half will be antineutrinos. As established in section III C the majority of these will be produced by the decay of light NG bosons and carry an energy of $\sim M_{NG}/2$ and a decay width of $\Delta \sim T \sim 0.1$MeV. These decay lines will be accompanied by a much smaller continuum emission from three body decays. There is also a contribution due to the small probability of annihilation of protons directly on the interface between the vacuum and the CS nuggets which may produce an energetic muon. For now this process will be assumed to make a negligible contribution to the total neutrino production rate and be lost in the three body continuum, but see our Conclusion for some further discussion of this process.

A. Neutrino emission model

While the exact structure of the various excitations of the CS is not known we may use expressions 6 and 7 to draw some general conclusions. A specific choice of μ and Δ determines the mass scales for the light NG modes. As argued above these parameters are generally taken to be $\mu \sim 400$ MeV and $\Delta \sim 100$ MeV in the CFL phase.The splitting between the K^+ and K^- states is then m_s^2/μ. In an antiquark CS the light K^- will produce a decay line in the antineutrino spectrum as will the heavier π^- as its three body decay to a final state including a K^- is Zweig suppressed even if it is energetically allowed. Zweig suppression also results in the production of a larger number of pions rather than of kaons such that the π^- decay line will be stronger than the K^- decay line by roughly a factor of ten and will contain the largest fraction of antineutrino produced. This line will be narrow, with thermal broadening at the level of ~ 0.1MeV. In order to compare to experimental results we will introduce a further broadening at the 1MeV scale corresponding to typical detector energy resolution. The antineutrino spectrum will also include continuum emission from the weak decay of heavier charged states. Though, as argued above this process is considerably disfavoured relative to decays to the lighter NG states. For demonstrative purposes we will assume that these processes account for one percent of antineutrino production, though the actual fraction could easily be smaller than this value. Larger chemical potentials correspond to lighter NG modes while the masses increase with the size of the gap Δ. As neutrino flux constraints generally become more stringent with increasing energy we consider the case $\mu = 350$MeV and $\Delta = 150$MeV which corresponds to relatively heavy K^- and pi^- modes and thus imposes more conservative constraints. The antineutrino spectrum resulting from this choice of parameters as well as the relevant constraints (to be discussed further below) are shown in figure 2.

The neutrino spectrum is slightly different from that of the antineutrinos due to the K^+/K^- mass splitting. The relatively heavy K^+ will tend to decay to a π^+ rather than directly producing a neutrino. Thus, in the neutrino spectrum we predict a single line from π^+ decays. As before this line will has an intrinsic width at the ~ 0.1MeV level, but will be broadened to match detector resolution. As with the antineutrino spectrum we will also assume the presence of a weaker continuum at the 1% level. The neutrino spectrum, assuming the μ and Δ values discussed above is shown in figure 1.

B. Observational constraints

Relatively high energy neutrinos produced in the three body decays of heavy modes are subject to the antineutrino flux limits imposed by SuperK [31] and cited by [1]. Specifically, the antineutrino flux limit of [31] is $\Phi_{\bar{\nu_e}} = 1.4 - 1.9\ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ for electron antineutrinos with energies above the 19.3 MeV threshold. This constraint is stronger than that imposed on electron neutrinos ($\Phi_{\nu_e} = 73.3 - 154\ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ in the same energy range) due to the relatively large inverse β-decay cross-section. Thus, while a roughly equal number of neutrinos and antineutrinos are produced the antineutrino constraints provide a stronger limit on nugget annihilation in this energy band. Based on this maximum flux we obtain an upper limit on the fraction of antineutrinos produced via three body decays with energies above the 19.3 MeV on the level of $\xi \leq 5\%$. This value is certainly compatible with the known properties of most CS phases as it is suppressed by a number of factors as argued in section III C.

The conventional solar neutrino spectrum forms a large background to any neutrino signal below $\sim$ 20 MeV. These solar neutrinos are produced in the rare ^{8}B and *hep* ($He + p$) nuclear reactions. The ^{8}B reactions are well measured and produce a total neutrino flux on the order of $6 \times 10^6\ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ [32] in good agreement with the predictions of the standard solar model [33]. The *hep* neutrino flux is estimated at $8 \times 10^3 \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ [33] but has yet to be observationally confirmed with current constraints just slightly above the predicted level [34]. Thus, at low energies we should compare any nugget associated signal to this known solar background. It should also be noted that the uncertainty in both the measured [32] and predicted [33] ^{8}B spectrum is larger than the flux of neutrinos expected to be generated by nugget annihilations. This large background, combined with the decreasing sensitivity of observations at low energies, will



FIG. 1. Predicted neutrino spectrum (flux in $cm^{-2}s^{-1}MeV^{-1}$) for the NG decays described in the text. For comparison the much larger solar neutrino flux from the ^{8}B (blue) and *hep* (green) processes taken from [33] is also shown. The red lines show present constraints from SuperK [31] (dashed) and the SNO *hep* search [34] (solid).



FIG. 2. Predicted antineutrino spectrum (flux in $cm^{-2}s^{-1}MeV^{-1}$) for the NG decays described in the text. Also shown are the high energy SuperK constraints from [31] (blue dotted line) and [35] (blue points) as well as the KamLAND constraints from [36] (red points).

make the detection of any nugget generated neutrino signal challenging. This is particularly true given that the majority of neutrinos are produced at the $\sim$ 10 MeV scale through the decay of the lightest NG modes. The resulting constraints on nugget annihilation rates from the neutrino channel are shown in figure (1).

The situation for antineutrinos is somewhat better. In addition to the gain in sensitivity from inverse beta scattering mentioned above there is relatively little solar background allowing for useful measurements at lower $\sim$ 10MeV energies. As well as the strong SuperK limits at large energies [31] there are constraints from the SuperK solar antineutrino search [35] and well as from KamLAND [36]. The resulting constraints, extending down to 8.8MeV are shown in figure (2).

As may be seen from figures 1 and 2 the neutrino flux associated with this representative nugget annihilation model is fully consistent with present constraints[6]. It should be noted that while, as we have argued here, nuggets in a CS phase can generically evade present constraints relatively modest improvements in these constraints (roughly a factor of four) will provide a powerful test of the viability of the quark nugget dark matter model. This is a particularly strong test of the model because, as shown in [1], the predicted neutrino flux is largely insensitive to the nuggets' mean baryon number across most of the applicable range. The solar antineutrino flux may therefore be used to search for a quark nugget dark matter signal even if the nuggets are near the higher end of their allowed parameter space. This region that is not easily accessible by other means and the search may be conducted using currently operating neutrino detectors.

CONCLUSION

The basic claim of the present paper is that the energetic neutrinos required for strong constraints from the SuperK data are not produced in the CFL phase and this claim also holds for most other CS phases. This is because the many other CS phases, such as 2SC (two flavour superconductor) all have massless ungapped modes which will dominate the annihilation products of interactions with solar matter. In these cases a typical neutrino's energy will be even smaller than in the gapped CFL phase. In making this claim we have assumed that the annihilation happens inside the nugget.

There is a small chance that the annihilation may happen on the sharp surface separating the CS from vacuum, in this case the annihilation products could include conventional π mesons and μ-leptons which indeed produce higher energy neutrinos. We think that the probability for this to happen is indeed very small, see the comments on this in section III B. For such rare events the analysis of ref. [1] is fully valid. Unfortunately, it is very hard to make any quantitative estimations for this type of annihilation on the surface in strongly coupled QCD. Therefore, we follow [4] and introduce a phenomenological coefficient for such annihilation on the surface χ_μ.

[6] Obviously, had the neutrino lines shown in figures 1 and 2 been shifted to energies above 20 MeV the flux attributed to the nuggets would exceed the constraints set by SuperK in that region. This would essentially correspond to the analysis presented in [1] where the decay of conventional hadronic states were assumed to dominate the nugget annihilation process.

This parameter is expected to be very small $\chi_\mu \ll 1$ because the probability for the annihilation on the interface between the CS and vacuum is strongly suppressed. With this phenomenological parameter the interpretation of the main results of ref. [1] can be restated as follows: the anti-nuggets cannot account for more that $(0.2/\chi_\mu)$ of the dark matter flux, in contrast with original claim in [1] of a 20% limit.

Finally, we should comment here that similar constraints also hold for antiquark nugget annihilation within Earth. We do not elaborate on this subject because the parameter space constrained by this process has been largely covered by other experiments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to Peter Gorham for bring to our attention the possible importance of neutrino constrains and for subsequent correspondence and comments. We also thank an anonymous Referee who suggested presenting the antineutrino spectrum separately from the neutrino data which resulted in Fig. 2. It may bring the $\bar{\nu}$- constraints to the level of needed for discovery, as one can see from the plot. We also thank Scott Oser who explained to us the basic properties, features and potentials of the existing neutrino detectors, which considerably improved our understanding on potentials to detect the ν-signals due to the QN dark matter model.

This research was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

[1] P. W. Gorham and B. J. Rotter, arXiv:1507.03545 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] M. G. Alford, A. Schmitt, K. Rajagopal and T. Schäfer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1455 (2008) [arXiv:0709.4635 [hep-ph]]
[3] K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, In *Shifman, M. (ed.): At the frontier of particle physics, vol. 3* 2061-2151 [hep-ph/0011333].
[4] K. Lawson, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 103520 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3288 [astro-ph.HE]].
[5] E. Witten Phys.Rev. D **30**, 272 (1984).
[6] A. R. Zhitnitsky, JCAP **0310**, 010 (2003) [hep-ph/0202161].
[7] D. H. Oaknin and A. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 023519 (2005) [hep-ph/0309086].
[8] A. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 043515 (2006) [astro-ph/0603064].
[9] K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Cosmic Frontier Workshop: Snowmass 2013 Menlo Park, USA, March 6-8, 2013. [arXiv:1305.6318].
[10] S. J. Asztalos, L. J. Rosenberg, K. van Bibber, P. Sikivie, K. Zioutas, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **56**, 293-326 (2006).
[11] P. Sikivie, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **25**, 554 (2010) [arXiv:0909.0949 [hep-ph]].
[12] L. J. Rosenberg, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (2015). doi:10.1073/pnas.1308788112
[13] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON100 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 6, 062009 (2014) [arXiv:1404.1455 [astro-ph.CO]].
[14] A. Atreya, A. Sarkar and A. M. Srivastava, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 4, 045010 (2014) [arXiv:1405.6492 [hep-ph]].
[15] IceCube Collaboration, Eyr. Phys. J. C **74**, 2938 (2014).
[16] P. W. Gorham, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 123005 (2012), [arXiv:1208.3697 [astro-ph.CO]].
[17] E. S. Abers, A. K. Bhatia, D. A. Dicus, W. W. Repko, D. C. Rosenbaum and V. L. Teplitz, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 023513 (2009) [arXiv:0712.4300 [astro-ph]].
[18] D. H. Oaknin and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 101301 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0406146].
[19] A. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 103518 (2007) [astro-ph/0607361].
[20] K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky, JCAP **0801**, 022 (2008), [arXiv:0704.3064 [astro-ph]].
[21] M. M. Forbes and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 083505 (2008) [arXiv:0802.3830 [astro-ph]].
[22] M. M. Forbes, K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 083510 (2010). [arXiv:0910.4541 [astro-ph.GA]].
[23] M. M. Forbes and A. R. Zhitnitsky, JCAP **0801**, 023 (2008) [astro-ph/0611506].
[24] K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Lett. B **724**, 17 (2013) [arXiv:1210.2400 [astro-ph.CO]].
[25] K. Lawson and A. R. Zhitnitsky, arXiv:1510.02092 [astro-ph.GA].
[26] T. Vachaspati, arXiv:1511.05095 [hep-th].
[27] I. N. Mishustin, L. M. Satarov, T. J. Burvenich, H. Stoecker, and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 035201 (2005), [arXiv:nucl-th/0404026].
[28] P. Jaikumar, M. Prakash and T. Schfer, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 063003 (2002) [astro-ph/0203088].
[29] S. Reddy, M. Sadzikowski and M. Tachibana, Nucl. Phys. A **714**, 337 (2003) [nucl-th/0203011].
[30] S. Reddy, M. Sadzikowski and M. Tachibana, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 053010 (2003) [nucl-th/0306015].
[31] C. Lunardini and O. L. G. Peres, JCAP **0808**, 033 (2008) [arXiv:0805.4225 [astro-ph]].
[32] S. N. Ahmed *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 181301 (2004) [nucl-ex/0309004].
[33] J. N. Bahcall, A. M. Serenelli and S. Basu, Astrophys. J. **621**, L85 (2005) [astro-ph/0412440].
[34] B. Aharmim *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **653**, 1545 (2006) [hep-ex/0607010].
[35] Y. Gando *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 171302 (2003) [hep-ex/0212067].
[36] A. Gando *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **745**, 193 (2012) [arXiv:1105.3516 [astro-ph.HE]].